

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Vignia 22313-1450 www.nspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/844,740	04/26/2001	Yoshiharu Kobayashi	YAMAP0503US	5367	
75	590 07/25/2003				
Mark D Saralino Esq			EXAMINER		
1621 Euclid Av	oisselle & Sklar LLP ve		JEAN PIERF	JEAN PIERRE, PEGUY	
19th Floor Cleveland, OH	44115		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
,, ,			2819	2819	
			DATE MAILED: 07/25/2003		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		A A				
	Application No.	pplicant(s)				
Advisory Action	09/844,740	KOBAYASHI ET AL.				
•	Examin r	Art Unit				
	Peguy JeanPierre	2819				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app						
THE REPLY FILED FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPET FAILS TO PLACE THE PLACE THIS APPET FAILS TO PLACE THI	 a timely filed amendment wh 	cation. A proper reply to a ich places the application in				
PERIOD FOR RE	EPLY [check either a) or b)]					
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of						
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advevent, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later the ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The data have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension of the scale of the shortened (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three meaning patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	nan SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THe steen which the petition under 37 CFR 1. Ission and the corresponding amount of the distallatory period for reply originally set in	of the final rejection. E FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 136(a) and the appropriate extension fee ender the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in				
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CF						
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:	•				
(a) they raise new issues that would require furth	er consideration and/or search	(see NOTE below);				
(b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);						
(c) they are not deemed to place the application issues for appeal; and/or	in better form for appeal by ma	terially reducing or simplifying the				
(d) they present additional claims without cance NOTE:	ling a corresponding number of	finally rejected claims.				
$3. \boxtimes$ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection	ction(s): <u>112 2nd paragraph rejec</u>	ction of claims 37-42.				
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).						
5. The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.						
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.						
For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) will not be entered or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.						
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:						
Claim(s) allowed: <u>1-36</u> .						
Claim(s) objected to:						
Claim(s) rejected: <u>37-42</u> .						
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:						
8. The proposed drawing correction filed on is	a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disap	proved by the Examiner.				
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Stateme	ent(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s).	·				
10. Other:		Peguy Jean Pierre Primary Examiner				
		Art Unit: 2819				



Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's argument with regard to claims 37-42 is not persuasive..